REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the non-final Office Action dated March 6, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-28 were previously pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-15 and 17-28 have been amended; and claims 4 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter therein. Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-15 and 17-28 are all the claims that remain pending in the present application. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

To facilitate the Examiner's reconsideration of the present application, the Applicants have provided amendments to the abstract. The amendments to the abstract include minor editorial and clarifying changes. A replacement abstract is provided on a separate sheet showing the changes to the original abstract. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the abstract.

In the Office Action, claims 23-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner has alleged that claims 23-25 are directed to a program *per se*, which is non-statutory functional descriptive material. Accordingly, the Applicants have herein amended independent claim 23 to recite that the program is "stored on a computer-readable medium for causing a computer to perform steps for print processing." As amended, independent claim 23 now clearly defines a structural and functional interrelationship between the program and the computer for performing the steps recited in the claim. Withdrawal of the rejection to claims 23-25 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claim 25 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleged that claim 25 at line 3-5 recites the phrase "in order in which the print data with the attribute generated from the print data in the writing step," which is unclear, vague and indefinite. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended the above phrase at lines 3-5 of claim 25 to clarify its meaning. Specifically, the Applicants have amended the above phrase consistent with the suggestion made by the Examiner. Accordingly,

withdrawal of the rejection to claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-28 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogino et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0054109, hereafter "Ogino"). The Applicants have amended independent claim 1, 13, 23 and 26 to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. Additionally, as noted above, claims 4 and 16 have been canceled rendering the above rejection to those claims moot.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites the following features (in relevant part) that are not believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art:

"[a] print control apparatus that performs print processing for printing by controlling a print engine in a printer which prints data contents based on print data indicating the contents t be printed, comprising:

a data generation unit operable to i) obtain the print data from outside the print control apparatus, and ii) generate print data with attributes by adding, to the print data, attribute information generated for the print data by the print control apparatus and indicating attributes of the print processing performed by the print control apparatus;...

an arrangement display unit operable to arrange and display print processing names included in the print data, each print processing name corresponding to one of a plurality of the print data with an attribute stored in a storage unit in an order according to the attribute information included in the plurality of print data with the attributes, each print processing name being a name included in indicating the print data...."

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 13, 23 and 26. Additionally, the above features are fully support by the Applicants' disclosure (i.e., pages 13-14 and Figures 7 and 8).

The present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 26, is directed to the use of print data that includes attributes that are generated by adding, to the print data, attribute information generated for the printing data by the print control apparatus. The attribute information indicates an attribute of the print processing and the print control apparatus.

Additionally, a print processing name for each of a plurality of print data with the attributes is arranged and displayed in an order according to the attribute information. The attribute information is, for example, order in which the print control apparatus writes the print data into the storage unit, a number of times the storage unit is read out, or the number of pieces of paper for printing.

The print control apparatus arranges and displays, based on an operation by a user, a plurality of stored print processing names in order according to the attribute information included with the print data with the attributes. The above features are implemented not for one-time print such as "secure print," but for arranging and displaying, a key, print job attribute information specified by the user when a large number of print jobs stored in a memory for a long time are printed repetitively at intervals.

The present invention, as recited in independent claim 1, 13, 23 and 26, provides the advantage of arranging and displaying a plurality of print processing names in the order according to the attribute information generated by the print control apparatus so that a user can easily make a comparison between a status or result of print processing for a plurality of data performed by the print control apparatus, and determine a status or a result of the desired print processing. Accordingly, a user can easily determine what measures need to be taken with regard to a printing operation.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Ogino for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 26. However, the Applicants maintain that Ogino fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 26 (as amended).

Specifically, Ogino is directed to a printing output user interface control method that provides user input setting support so that a user can set printing job information suitable for determining a display capability of a printing output device. As described in Ogino, a display capability match/comparison section conducts a comparison process between a user name and print job name, and the display capability information received. Based on the comparison, it is determined whether the indication of the names is suitable for the display capability of the

printing output device or not. A comparison result processing section receives the comparison result, and when the result indicates that the display capability is not suitable for display, a notification is sent to a user.

Thus, although Ogino appears to disclose displaying print job names (i.e., print processing names) in an order according to user names, the reference is clearly different from the present invention. Specifically, in Ogino, a printer (i.e., print control apparatus) does not generate a user name, which is different from attribute information generated by the print control apparatus, as in the present invention.

Further, Ogino fails to disclose a structure which allows a user to input (by operating a printer) information (i.e., attribute information), which is the basis for deciding a display order. Additionally, Ogino also fails to describe a technique for easily locating desired print data among a large amount of print data stored in a memory.

In summary, although Ogino discloses a plurality of print job names that are arranged in a display, the reference fails to disclose that the print data with the attributes is generated by adding the attribute information, and that each of a plurality of print data with attribute information is arranged and displayed in an order according to the attribute information.

Based on the foregoing, independent claims 1, 13, 23 and 26 (as amended) are not believed to be anticipated or rendered obvious by Ogino. Additionally, dependent claims 2, 3, 5-12, 14, 15, 17-22, 24, 25, 27 and 28 are also not believed to be anticipated or rendered obvious by Ogino by virtue of their respective dependency from independent claim 1, 13, 23 and 26.

In light of the above, the Applicants submit that all the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections presented in the Office Action dated March 6, 2008, and pass the application issue. The Examiner is also invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Tatsuo KAMEI

/Mark D. Pratt/
2008.06.05 12:00:24 -04'00'

By: _____
Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 5, 2008